UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,942	12/11/2003	William Kress Bodin	AUS920030997US1	8684

34533 7590 02/27/2006

INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER	
FABER, DAVID	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2178	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/733,942	BODIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Faber	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/9/05, 12/11/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 11 December 2003.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 12, and 23 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11 December 2003 and 9 May 2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 11 December 2003 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5, 12-16, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336).

As per independent Claim 1, Ladd et al discloses a method:

- providing a session document for a presentation, wherein the session document includes a session grammar and a session structured document; (FIG 8 and 9 discloses a flowchart of a weather application using a document based on the structure of FIG 6. Column 38, line 20 – Column 40, line 24 disclose the markup language document used for FIG 8 and Column 41, line 13 – Column 43, line 52 disclose the markup language document used for FIG 9. Each document contains grammar elements (Column 15, lines 62-64; Column 16, lines 5-17), where each element such as DIALOG and INPUT are fully disclosed in detailed with examples from Column 16, line 41 – Column 37, line 59)
- selecting from the session structured document a classified structural element in dependence upon user classifications of a user participant in the presentation; and (FIG 8, 9; Column 37, line 60 – Column 43, line 52: Discloses the ability for a user to specify to hear the weather, news, or the market content through a voice action. FIG 8, and Column 38, lines 4-11 disclose the ability on the user responding with a choice stating to hear the weather. When the user speaks a city name, the element containing the city's weather information is triggered, and presented as audio to the user. In addition, Ladd et al states users can access all kinds of up-to-date information. (Column 2, lines 48-58; Column 43, lines 54-63)
- presenting the selected structural element to the user.(FIG 8; Column 37, line 60 – Column 38, line 3: After inputting a city name when asked by the prompt,

the city information chosen provided as a structural element within the document (Column 38, line 20 – Column 40, line 24) is presented as audio to the user.)

As per dependent Claim 2, Ladd et al discloses a method further comprising:

- the presentation control instruction includes a presentation action identifier and one or more optional parameters; and (Column 23, line 45 – Column 24, line 12: Discloses an example of using markup language grammar elements to input a user's phone number. The example shown contains an action sequence where the one line read is a prompt where it asks for a phone number. The PHONE input identifier collects the number said by the user, where the number is stored as a string variable, and then is instructed to go the STEP "fax", but the NEXT attribute/parameter. Column 40, lines 45-56, discloses different attributes that PHONE input can contain.)
- selecting a classified structural element includes selecting a classified structural element in dependence upon the presentation action identifier and the parameters. (FIG 6 discloses an embodiment of the use of the OPTIONLIST input of the INPUT attribute of the markup language. The user selects an element based on the classifications of food for breakfast, lunch, or dinner. When the user inputs his or her choice, the choice triggers a new state by going to the STEP element corresponding to the input, and presents the information to the user of that choice. The use of OPTIONLIST can

include multiple attributes when creating the OPTIONLIST input instruction identifier.

As per dependent Claim 3, Ladd et al discloses a method:

- receiving from a user participating in the presentation a key phrase and optional parameters for invoking a presentation action; and (Ladd et al discloses having a voice recognition engine having a vocabulary for detecting a speech pattern (key word). (Column 8, lines 23-25) Column 9, lines 26-44 discloses automatic speech recognition from the user in which the unit processes the speech inputs from the user to determine whether a word or a speech pattern matches any of the grammar or vocabulary in the database or from the voice browser. When a selected speech pattern is identified from the speech inputted, an output signal is implemented the specific function associated with the recognized voice pattern. Column 10, lines 3-20, discloses the detection unit for performing the identification. This is performed as in e.g. FIG 6 when the user inputs which meal to hear the specials. For example, the user speaks, "breakfast", being a key word, is identified by the speech recognition as a key word, triggers the action identifier with the attribute NEXT to go the next STEP element containing the breakfast name.

- parsing the key phrase and parameters against a voice response grammar into a presentation control instruction. (Column 9, lines 32-39: Discloses

recognizing a key phrase from inputted speech, and triggering an output signal to implement the specific function associated with the recognized voice pattern. This is performed as in e.g. FIG 6 when the user inputs which meal to hear the specials. For example, the user speaks, "breakfast", being a key word, is identified by the speech recognition as a key word, triggers the action identifier with the attribute NEXT to go the next STEP element containing the breakfast name.

As per dependent Claim 4, Ladd et al discloses a method:

- selecting a classified structural element further comprises selecting a classified structural element having an associated classification identifier that corresponds to the user classification. (FIG 8, 9; Column 37, line 60 – Column 43, line 52: Discloses the ability for a user to specify to hear the weather, news, or the market through a voice action. FIG 8, (Column 38, lines 4-11) discloses the ability on the user responding with a choice stating to hear the weather. Column 37, line 60 – Column 43, line 52, lists the source of the document wherein each element of city weather contains an identifier reflecting the city the weather is associated with. When the user decides to choose a city to based on the list presented to that user, the user speaks a city. Each city option at the listing contain an pointer to the structural element and its identifier containing the city's weather information. Thus, when the city

name spoken, the name triggers the pointer to go to that corresponding identifier where the pointer was pointing.

As per dependent Claim 5, Ladd et al discloses a method:

- selecting a data communications protocol for the presentation; (Column 2, lines 26-39) Column 5, lines 36-50 discloses a electronic network comprising a telecommunications network and a communication node connected via a high-speed data link such as T1 or LAN. In addition, Column 6, line 65-Column 7, line 7 discloses the use of a VOIP unit that allows the user to access the communications node via the internet using voice commands. (Column 9, lines 55-58)
- inserting the selected structural element in a data structure appropriate to the data communications protocol; and (Column 9, lines 63-65: Discloses the VOIP receiving speech inputs or communications from the user and convert the speech inputs to a VOIP protocol for transmitting over the internet.)
- transmitting the data structure to the user according to the data communications protocol. (Column 9, lines 58-61: Discloses ability to receive VOIP protocols transmitted over the internet and convert the protocols to speech information or data.)

As per independent Claim 12, Claim 12 recites a system for performing the method of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 12 is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 13, Claim 13 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 14, Claim 14 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 15, Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per independent Claim 23, Claim 23 recites a computer program product for performing the method of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 23 is similarly rejected under Ladd et al. Furthermore, Hosea et al discloses a recording medium (Column 2, lines 64-65)

As per dependent Claim 24, Claim 24 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 25, Claim 25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 26, Claim 26 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6-8, 17-19, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001) in further view of Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002).

As per dependent Claim 6, Ladd et al discloses a method further comprising:

- identifying a presentation document for a presentation, the presentation document including a presentation grammar and a structured document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers; (FIG 8 and 9 discloses a flowchart of a weather application using a document based on the structure of FIG 6. Column 38, line 20 – Column 40, line 24 disclose the markup language document used for FIG 8 and Column 41, line 13 – Column 43, line 52 disclose the markup language document used for FIG 9. Each document contains grammar elements (Column 15, lines 62-64; Column 16, lines 5-17), where each element such as DIALOG and INPUT are fully disclosed in detailed with examples from Column 16, line 41 – Column 37, line 59. In addition, each structural element associated with city's weather information contains identifiers, the use of the STEP element, that disclose that city's information.)

Ladd et al fails to specifically disclose identifying a user participant for the presentation, the user having a user profile comprising user classifications; and filtering the structured document in dependence upon the user classifications and the classification identifiers to create a session document. However Hosea et al discloses the use of obtaining a user profile for document personalization that contains user preferences that include demographic and psychographic data (e.g. Paragraph 0041, lines 5-14; Paragraph 0048) wherein Paragraph 0042 describes how user preferences are generated. In addition, Hosea et al disclose the use of filtering a document by using an HTML (document) file/profile (Paragraph 0045, lines 6-17) and a user profile by comparing the classifications of each content component associated with the HTML file/profile with the user profile containing user classifications into creating a modified personalized web page. (Paragraph 0046-0047)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Ladd et al's method with Hosea et al's personalization web page method since Hosea et al's method involving the use of a user profile would have provided the benefit of filtering content of Web pages for delivery to requesting users.

As per dependent Claim 7, Ladd et al fails to specifically disclose extracting, from the structured document, structural elements having classification identifiers corresponding to the user classifications; and writing the extracted structural elements into a session structured document in the session document. However Hosea et al discloses in Paragraph 0043, lines 14-15, that the HTML file is parsed to extract the

constituent components, which include content components with formatting components (Paragraph 0043, lines 5-7), and analyzing and rating the content components. Then, Hosea et al discloses in Paragraph 0047, lines 1-3, using the classification of each content component from the HTML profile/file to analyze its relevance to the requesting user wherein Paragraph 0046 discloses the process of comparing the components to the interest of the user and is either eliminated, rearranged, or new content may be added. Thus, a new modified Web page is created with the included components by the user preferences (Paragraph 0047)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Ladd et al's method with Hosea et al's personalization web page method since Hosea et al's method of rearranging content on a published Web page would have provided benefit to the user in which content determined to be of higher interest to a user is more prominently featured or more easily or quickly assessable wherein content determined to be low interest to a user is eliminated.

As per dependent Claim 8, Ladd et al fails to specifically disclose that filtering the presentation grammar, in dependence upon the extracted structural elements, into a session grammar in the session document. However, Ladd et al discloses that the voice browser determines if pre-determined grammar or pre-existing grammar is contained in the markup language. (Column 14, lines 18-20) In addition, Ladd et al discloses the markup language contains text, navigational controls, and input controls for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64) and the markup language can include elements

that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. (Column 16, lines 11-14). In addition, Hosea et al disclose the use of filtering a document by using an HTML (document) file/profile (Paragraph 0045, lines 6-17) and a user profile by comparing the classifications of each content component associated with the HTML file/profile with the user profile containing user classifications into creating a modified personalized web page. (Paragraph 0046-0047) Ladd et al's method of structural elements that contain voice commands, navigational controls, or voice place markers in a markup language can be incorporated into the structural components of Hosea et al's method allowing the creation of the modified HTML file in Hosea et al's that only contains voice elements to its relevant components, which links to the corresponding selected grammar, thus filtering out the grammar of the presentation document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Ladd et al's method with Hosea et al's personalization web page method since Hosea et al's method would have provided the benefit of arranging constituent components, that may include grammar specific components, of the requested Web page to better suit the interests of that user.

As per dependent Claim 17, Claim 17 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al and Hosea et al.

As per dependent Claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al and Hosea et al.

As per dependent Claim 19, Claim 19 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al and Hosea et al.

As per dependent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al and Hosea et al.

As per dependent Claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al and Hosea et al.

As per dependent Claim 30, Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al and Hosea et al.

9. Claims 9-11, 20-22, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001) in further view of Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002) in further view of Huang (US PGPub 2001/0032218, published 10/18/2001)

As per dependent Claim 9, Ladd et al discloses a method further comprising:

- creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements; (Abstract, lines 12-18; Column 16, lines 5-20, discloses the elements describing the structure of the document, providing pronunciation of words and phrases, and place markers (identifiers) in the text to control interactive voice services, such as controlling phrasing, emphasis, pitch, and speaking rate.)
- creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes an identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document. (Ladd et al discloses the use a markup

language that document having a plurality of elements, that include markup tags, wherein elements describe the structure of the document, provide pronunciation of words and phrases, and place markers (identifiers) in the text to control interactive voice services, such as controlling phrasing, emphasis, pitch, and speaking rate. (Column 16, lines 5-20) The markup language also includes input controls for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64). Using a voice browser application to interrupt the markup language document, a grammar is dynamically created if a pre-existing grammar is not found in a stored database, and once generated it is sent to the VRU server. (Column 14, lines 18-42))

However, Ladd et al and Hosea et al fail to specifically disclose classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute. However, Huang discloses an identifier is assigned to each document element that may include a name, font, type name, or a color where the identifier is in data of each of the document elements. (Paragraph 0050, lines 5-7) In addition, FIG. 7 discloses the arranging of character data within classification element tags, such as ingredient, wherein each of the data elements for the character data contains element presentation attributes for font types and font colors. (FIG. 7, 706)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Ladd et al and Hosea et al's method with Huang's method since Huang's method of using an identifier would have provided the

benefit of associating data elements and document elements for generating structured documents.

As per dependent Claim 10, Ladd et al and Hosea et al fail to specifically disclose identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element; identifying a classification identifier in dependence upon the presentation attribute; and inserting the classification identifier in association with the structural element in the structured document. However, Huang discloses using an association table (FIG. 5; Paragraph 0067, Page 6, lines 3-6) for the document elements defined in a desired DTD and associated font attributes which parses the input document into data elements and its assigned font attributes. (Paragraph 0067) FIG. 6 discloses an editing result for the unstructured document in which each parsed data elements are assigned with font attributes that also involves region grouping of data elements. Hence, ingredient elements are grouped together, and so are procedure elements. In correlation with the association table, the grouped elements are identified under one element, such as ingredient, and are inserted during the converting of the structured document. FIG 7 discloses the insertion of element tags with each of its assigned attributes, which were assigned when the document was parsed, in which the use of mapping rules converted documents into a structured document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Ladd et al and Hosea et al's method with Huang's method since Huang's method would have provided the benefit of associating

information for creating or converting an unstructured or structured document into a structured document with a specific DTD.

As per dependent Claim 11, Ladd et al discloses a method:

- identifying the content type of the original document. (FIG 4; Column 14, lines 1-9 : Discloses fetching a document and processing the contents of the document and building a tree structure (detailed in Column 12, lines 17-25)
- selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and (Ladd et al discloses selecting a grammar from a pre-determined/existing grammar stored in a database or in the markup language based on the user inputs. (Column 14, lines 18-42)
- filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document. (Ladd et al discloses selecting a grammar from a pre-determined/existing grammar stored in a database or in the markup language based on the user inputs. (Column 14, lines 18-42). Thus, it is choosing from a database of multiple grammars the correct grammar for the corresponding user, retrieves it, and sends the grammar for speech recognition of the user. The process is filtering a grammar from a database of grammars to be used for the user based on the document being used. (Column 14, lines 1-9)

As per dependent Claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al, Hosea et al, and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al, Hosea et al, and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 22, Claim 22 recites similar limitations as in Claim 11 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al, Hosea et al, and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 31, Claim 31 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al, Hosea et al, and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 32, Claim 32 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al, Hosea et al, and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 33, Claim 33 recites similar limitations as in Claim 11 and is similarly rejected under Ladd et al, Hosea et al, and Huang.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Chao (US PGPub 20040205081): Discloses classifying elements of a document.
- Ikeda et al (US Patent #6,505,195): Discloses the classification of retrievable documents according to types of attribute elements.
- Isaac et al (US Patent #6,647,531): Discloses the constructing a customized document from an original document.

- Nazem et al (US Patent #5,983,227): Discloses the constructing a customized document from an original document.
- Kelsey (US PGPub 20010054048): Discloses forming a structural document.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Faber
Patent Examiner
AU 2178

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT E...